



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Martin Luther and the Reformation in Historical Thought, 1517-2017

Dixon, S. (2017). Martin Luther and the Reformation in Historical Thought, 1517-2017. *Studies*, 106(424), 404-416. <http://www.studiesirishreview.ie/product/martin-luther-and-the-reformation-in-historical-thought-1517-2017/>

Published in:
Studies

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
Copyright 2017 Studies. This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Martin Luther and the Reformation in Historical Thought, 1517-2017

C. Scott Dixon

On 10 November 1837 Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen, professor extraordinarius at the University of Berlin, gave a talk entitled 'Proof, that Dr Martin Luther never existed'. As a specialist in medieval German sagas, von der Hagen used all of his considerable learning to convince his audience that there were too many historico-mythical topoi in Luther's life to take him seriously as a real historical figure. Like a Sun God or an Emperor of the Moon, he claimed, Luther belonged to the realm of myth. To make his point, von der Hagen reviewed Luther's life as if he were deconstructing a medieval saga. A few examples will give something of the sense. Von der Hagen explained how Luther's early youth was spent in the town of Eisleben, which, by combining ice (*Eis* in German), the symbol of death, with the condition of life (*Leben*), recalls the Nordic myths of creation, wherein the river of life flows out of the ice of ages melted by heat and light. Just like the great Germanic hero Siegfried, Luther was a dragon slayer, overcoming his enemies the pope and the Catholic emperor at Worms. Indeed, he even married a virgin, Katharina von Bora, whose name was derived from the word Katharener, that is, the pure Cathars, which reveals that his bride was in fact no less than the Gnostic Maria once worshipped by this heretical sect. Von der Hagen continued in this key until he wrapped up his talk with the claim that Luther was just as unlikely to have died as he was to have been

born. He is merely an idea and an idol, a myth and a fairy tale used to lend credence to the faith.¹

In truth, von der Hagen's paper was just an 'occasional joke' staged for the Luther-Schiller *Festmahl*, a warm-up for the evening meal. For the purposes of this paper, however, I would like to take it seriously for its rather far-fetched lessons for the study of the historical Luther and the Reformation. For von der Hagen was not far from the truth in suggesting that the writing of Reformation history has often been an exercise in mythology, even if it has not been imagined in such extreme terms. From the very beginning, the Reformation has been the subject of the hopes, dreams, and distortions of the people who wrote its histories. The contexts behind these interpretations have changed, just as the resultant histories of the Reformation have changed, but there has been a consistent belief from day one that Luther's posting of the theses and the subsequent process of religious reform transformed the world radically from what it had been 'once upon a time'. In what follows I would like to offer a brief survey of these changing perceptions, beginning with the age of Reformation itself and continuing up to the present day. My purpose is to shed some light on how different people at different times have perceived the same historical event (or process) and spoke about it in different ways.

The first histories of Martin Luther and the Reformation, those written during the confessional age (1517-1648), belong to the genre of sacral or confessional history. Its purpose was not to capture or uncover objective truths about the past. Its purpose was to explain, and ultimately to legitimate, the reasons for the break from

Rome. They were studies in theological rather than historical truth. In the main, two approaches predominated. The first was devised by Luther's Wittenberg colleague Philipp Melanchthon, who integrated the history of the early Reformation into the broader providential framework of the Christian past. He did this by adopting the fourfold Danielic scheme of universal history (in which history progresses through four empires: Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman) and combining it with the threefold scheme for church history associated with the prophet Elias (in which history is ordered before the Law, under the Law, after the Law). Melanchthon then carefully shifted around the scales of time and the march of historical events until all of Christian history fell into place with the Reformation.

Ultimately more influential than this scheme, however, was the approach developed by the mid-century Croatian reformer Matthias Flacius Illyricus. In his work the *Magdeburg Centuries*, Flacius developed a model of Protestant history which set out to prove that Catholicism had drifted away from the original apostolic archetype until it had finally succumbed to the Antichrist. Flacius explained his approach in a letter to a colleague:

I am going about with a great plan ...First, I want to write a catalog of all the men that before Martin Luther of blessed memory fought the pope and his errors. Then I would wish that a church history would be written, in which in a certain order and in sequence it would be demonstrated how the true church and its religion gradually fell off the track from that original purity and

simplicity in the apostolic time because of the negligence and ignorance of teachers, and also partly through the evil of the godless. Then it must be shown that at times the church was restored by a few really faithful men, and why the light of truth sometimes shone more clearly, and sometimes under the growing darkness of godless entity it was again more or less darkened – until, finally at our time, when the truth was almost totally destroyed, through God's unbounded benefice, the true religion in its purity was again restored.²

In this scheme, retrospectively, Protestant history becomes the true history of Christianity as borne out by the march of rediscovered witnesses, who were often heretics, anti-papal theorists, and reforming monks cast out of the church.

All of these early confessional histories portrayed Luther as the divinely inspired leader of the Reformation: a man literally sent by God. Many were written by colleagues who had witnessed Luther in the struggle against Rome. These are the men who likened him to a prophet, a wonder-worker, the angel of the apocalypse, a latter-day apostle, an instrument of God, and even the third Elias. Because devotion of this kind had strong overtones of medieval hagiography, it has prompted some scholars to suggest that the early Protestants treated Luther as a type of saint, replete with images of halos, powers of prophecy, and even the ability to work miracles, as evidenced by the incombustible portraits that emerged after his death. This does capture the spirit of the early days, though over time this tendency to treat Luther as a cultic figure waned, and partly due to the simple passage of time. While Johannes

Mathesius, one of the first Reformation historians, could draw on personal recollections, second-generation historians such as Nikolas Selnecker could only recall childhood encounters, while Valerius Herberger, who published his life of Luther in 1608, had to begin a personal anecdote with the claim that ‘I once knew an old preacher, who had often seen and heard Luther...’.³ But whatever the status or the immediacy of Luther in the narrative, the tendency to treat the Reformation as a providential event remained throughout the confessional period.

The first history was thus sacral history, but over the course of the confessional period the Reformation narrative began to change. There were a number of reasons for this. To begin with, Lutherans began to fight among themselves. By mid-century two parties had emerged, each claiming to represent the legacy of the Reformation, each writing its own distinct histories, each editing its own versions of Luther’s work. Additionally, there was a growing need to develop a deeper theological and historical legitimation for their church than just the notion of providentialism, and this often resulted in downplaying the importance of Luther and Wittenberg. As early as 1617, on the occasion of the centenary celebrations, the Ulm superintendent Konrad Dietrich could claim that Luther was ‘not the one who instituted our evangelical teaching but the one who reinstituted it, not the one who introduced it but the one who reintroduced it, not the one who authored it but the one who restored it, not its promulgator, but the one who purged it, not its innovator but its renovator’.⁴

But even more important than the growing rift within German Lutheranism was the emerging sense of confessional identity in other Protestant churches. Of

course, the Reformed tradition had a different story of origins than that of the Lutherans, with Zwingli and Calvin as the founders rather than Luther and Melancthon. In the beginning, with Lutheranism ascendant, most historians tried to effect a balance, as did Heinrich Bullinger in his *Reformation History* (1564) when he spoke of Luther's attack on indulgences as the moment of origin, but added that this was no more than what Zwingli had been doing one and half years previously while in the parish of Glarus. Subsequent Reformed historians, such as Jacques Basnages de Beauval, were less diplomatic, simply declaring that Zwingli was the first reformer as he was preaching against Roman abuses in 1516. These contrasting narratives created some awkward silences during the centenary celebrations of 1617, for while the Lutherans continued to stress the unique role played by Luther, Reformed Protestants tended to speak more generally about medieval decline, the reforming visions of Erasmus and Zwingli, or the coming of the Word.

Though Lutherans and Calvinists thought little of each other at the time, most could at least agree that being a Catholic was worse. Thus it was of great concern to all Protestants when Catholics also started to write histories of the Reformation. Papal theologians had published their views on Luther and the Reformation from the very beginning. Answering Wittenberg's media assault tit-for-tat, controversialists such as Johannes Eck, Hieronymus Emser, and Johannes Cochlaeus condemned the movement, its heretical teaching, and its implications for the Church. Some of these efforts were substantial works of research in themselves, particularly the *Commentaries* of Cochlaeus, an 'anti-biography' of Luther based on a very

sophisticated source-base; but most were just throw-away polemics full of insults, accusations, condemnations, and inversions of Lutheran claims. To give something of the sense: the Jesuit theologian Conrad Vetter, writing in response to the claim that Luther was the prophet of God, asked his readers to imagine ‘that God would allow the Holy Spirit to take refuge in such a foul pool and stinking manure pit, much less settle there or reside. And this is not even to mention that the Spirit should have spoken through this malodorous Pilate and vile-smelling pig’s snout’.⁵

These polemics raged throughout the period, and in truth they did little to dislodge the Protestant narrative, but in the late seventeenth century a number of Catholic histories appeared of enough substance and authority to influence the way the world viewed Luther and the Reformation. Premier among them was Jacques Benigne Bossuet’s *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches* (1688). In part it was the author rather than the book that set Protestant pulses racing. Bossuet, court preacher and bishop of Meaux, was the main ideologue and full-time architect behind the absolutism of Louis XIV. Thus when Bossuet published his critical history of Luther and the Reformation, years into his campaign of persecution against the Huguenots, it had the added sting of Catholic militarism. According to Bossuet, the Reformation had given rise to a false, heretical faith that had brought ruin to the True Church. By its very nature, since Protestantism lacked a central authority or magisterium in the manner of the Catholic church, it could only lead to division, disunity, chaos, and ultimately damnation. And the same effects would necessarily follow in the social and political realm, and indeed as he remarked, history had

proven that the evangelicals were as ready to take up the sword as they were to engage in disputation. The simple study of the past was enough to reveal the errors of the Reformation church. As Bossuet wrote in his introduction:

If Protestants really knew the origins of their religion, the degrees of variation and inconstancy that went into the making of their confessions of faith, how they first separated themselves from us, then from each other, how many subtleties, evasions, and equivocations that have effected to repair their divisions and reunite the disjointed members of their disjointed Reformation, this Reformation of which they so boast would afford them little satisfaction – and indeed, if I may speak freely, it would inspire little less than contempt.⁶

Bossuet's book levelled a powerful argument against the Reformation: not only had it created a false religion, it had planted the seeds of chaos and disunity. This demanded a Protestant response, and it came quickly in the form of the most important work of Reformation history to appear before the age of Ranke. Published in 1688 as *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutheranism*, and known in English as the *History of Lutheranism*, its author was the Saxon statesman Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff. Seckendorff wrote the work specifically to refute the charges made by the Jesuit historian Louis Maimbourg, but in so doing he also engaged the accusations levelled by Bossuet. It was important because the overarching logic of the work was historical rather than theological. Seckendorff set

out to refute the arguments by the weight of example rather than the depth of faith. The result was a source-driven narrative, at times an almost day-to-day recreation of the past, and it laid bare the contingency of Reformation history and the full human dimensions of the process. Today we would say it is as much a social or political history as a study in religious reform, but its central importance was not derived from its theories but rather its substance. No other Reformation historian had ever worked through so much archival material. As Seckendorff recalled in his preface, he had spent hours going through piles of documents and making excerpts and copies, ultimately to the detriment of his health. Of particular importance was the fact that he included references to the source materials, right down to shelf numbers and signatures.

After Seckendorff, all serious historians, Protestant and Catholic alike, had to measure up to his method, and this had two important consequences for the perception of the Reformation. First, it worked as a catalyst for a massive, international project of recovery and reconstruction. Although it may be rather difficult to comprehend from our vantage point of 2017, for the first century and a half after Luther's death, little had been done to preserve the historical legacy of the Reformation. No steps had been taken, for instance, to conserve Luther's personal papers; there were no inventories of Reformation manuscripts, no substantial attempts to write new histories based on archival materials. Even the so-called sites of memory had been neglected: Luther's Eisleben birth-house fell into a state of disrepair, its windows stuffed with straw, while his famous Wittenberg study was

used to store grain. All of this changed in the early eighteenth century. Scholars began to collect, collate, and catalogue materials from the age of Reformation, much of which lay buried in public and private collections. A representative effort in this vein was Georg Heinrich Goetz's *De Reliquiis Lutheri* (1703), a stocktaking of the extant manuscripts, books, objects, and places associated with Luther's memory.

The second reason relates to this initiative. As soon as this material had been gathered, it was published in source anthologies and integrated into historical narratives. Over a century after the appearance of the Wittenberg and Jena editions, there were now new expanded collections of Luther's works, new volumes of his letters, reprints of important Reformation publications, and a groundswell of national and regional histories, many based on archival research. The end result was a quantum leap in the understanding of the Reformation and a reshaping of the narrative into the one that is familiar to us today.

This new version of the Reformation was different to the one which originated in the confessional age: fuller, better-informed, and historically grounded. But the most profound change of all came with the new spirit at work. All of this research activity occurred during the eighteenth century, the age of Enlightenment. For most intellectuals, reason rather than faith was the highest value of the day, and this transformed the way scholars wrote their accounts. First, history became much more of an exact science, by which is meant that scholars placed greater stress on critical use of the primary sources. Second, historians began to divest Church history of the supernatural. There was no longer a place for divine intervention, no need for

revelation in works of history where research and reason would suffice. And finally, and following from both of these factors, the study of Church history gradually succumbed to secular trends, both intellectual and social. The records of the past contained ‘mere facts’, nothing inherently revelatory or sacred, and the historian needed to apply the same standards to the interpretation of the spiritual as the secular past.

We can get a sense of how this transformed the narrative with a close look at one of the Reformation’s most famous episodes, Luther’s posting of the 95 theses on 31 October 1517. In the original accounts, Luther was portrayed as a tool of God’s will, an unwitting agent of providence. He was termed the instrument of the divine, a temple or vessel through which God effected the ‘last Reformation’. The posting was part of the providential plan, revealed in advance in prophecies and dreams, important because it marked the point of return to a Protestant notion of the True Church. In the Enlightenment histories, in contrast, there was less talk of divine intervention, just analyses of growing religious and political tensions, broader intellectual and cultural developments, and even universal cycles of history. As Gottlieb Samuel Treuer put it, ‘by human reckoning, the beginning of the sixteenth century was simply the right time for a great revolution in the Church. Anyone of intelligence could have taken a leaf from Machiavelli and quite easily have seen this coming’.⁷

Luther was still the founding father, but his role and his intentions had changed. In the Enlightenment version, Luther’s resolve to take a stand in the

indulgence debate was due to his desire to defend the rational interest and free the Christian conscience from the yoke of late-medieval superstition. He was a freedom fighter of the soul and a champion of the spirit, a hero in the classical mould. 'Luther was a man of this kind,' read an entry in the *Berlin Journal for Enlightenment*, 'as are all who play a leading role in the theatre of the world. Enterprising, fearless, resolute, merciless in the face of prejudice and superstition...'.⁸ He was the first-born of *modern* men and his Reformation the moment when mankind passed from the medieval to the modern.

By the nineteenth century, the narrative of the heroic Luther and his Reformation as the birth of the modern age had become the common property of all Protestants. American Lutherans, for instance, readily celebrated the Reformation and what they considered its legacy to their nation (democracy, freedom, education, individualism) by claiming that Luther was speaking not a German truth but the general truths in the Bible. Nevertheless, there was still a powerful nativism at the heart of the story, and this remained German. In part it was the product of historical circumstance. Napoleon's steady march over the lands and traditions of central Europe had unleashed powerful sentiments of patriotism and historical nostalgia, and this turned Luther and his Reformation into the specific symbol of *German* nationhood. As the historian Heinrich von Treitschke remarked in 1883:

No other modern nation can boast of a man who was the mouthpiece of his countrymen in quite the same way, and who also succeeded as fully in giving expression to the deepest essence of his nation... ‘Here speaks our own blood’.⁹

Indeed, Germany experienced a wave of Luthermania during the build-up to the birthday celebrations of 1883. The memorials and sites of memory that we enjoy today, from the statues in the Wittenberg market square and the bronze doors on the Castle Church to the birth and death houses in Eisleben and the *Lutherstube* – all were the gothic reconstructions of this period. And there were lasting monuments of scholarship as well, a steady stream of new histories and edited source collections, from Leopold von Ranke’s revolutionary study of the Reformation to the 121-volume, 80,000 folio-page Weimar edition of Luther’s works, which only published its final volume in 2009.

There is a curious episode from this period that sheds some light on this late-modern Luthermania. In the 1890s, scholars noticed a suspiciously large number of antique books in circulation with autograph dedications in Luther’s own hand. On the surface, this was not too unusual, as Reformation memorabilia had become extremely popular and there was an active market. But some things did not sit quite right. To start with there were too many specimens, predominantly Latin texts, and some were dedicated to men with no trace in the historical record. Alarm bells started to sound, and in 1905 the literary scholar Max Hermann exposed them for what they were: forgeries. To be more precise, he exposed a stray leaf of an alleged autograph

copy of Luther's *A Mighty Fortress is our God* as a fake, and the way he did so is testimony to the depth of knowledge and interest at the time. Drawing on his familiarity with Luther's hand, both from rediscovered original documents and the facsimiles in the Weimar volumes, Hermann identified discrepancies. The use of a capital N was unusual, as Luther preferred a large rounded lower case letter, and the overall uniformity of the script was suspicious, as Luther often wrote in haste, rounding out letters and omitting diachronic marks. And there were some clear errors: Luther used a v rather than a u in the word 'und', and he tended to use saints' days for dating.

Satisfied with his orthographic findings, Hermann then passed on the leaf to Dr Paul Jeserich, a forensic chemist in Berlin known as Germany's Sherlock Holmes. Through a close study of worm holes and ink flow, Jeserich confirmed that the paper and the ink were of different periods and the stray leaf did not belong to the book. The counterfeit was confirmed. Eventually some forgeries were traced back to a bookshop in Milan, and this in turn lead to the culprit: Hermann Kyrieleis, an illiterate trader, described by the criminal courts of Berlin as 'not in full control of his mental faculties', who had forged over 90 Luther dedications and sold them through bookshops on the open market. All of this was possible because so many people wanted to have them, because so much scholarship and scholarly aids were now available for even an illiterate such as Kyrieleis to forge them, and because the breadth of historical knowledge and technical expertise existed in order to expose them.¹⁰

Thus by the time the quadcentenary of 1917 arrived, the knowledge and the popularity of the Reformation had reached a new peak. The Enlightenment association of the Reformation with the birth of the modern age had become a standard theme, and it was now further refined and ‘proven’ with the help of even bigger ideas. Scholars added the flesh of theory to the historical bone. Following in the footsteps of thinkers such as Marx, Durkheim, Weber, and Troeltsch, historians explained the conditions of the present by looking for the foundations in the Reformation past. Perhaps the most famous example of this was Max Weber’s theory that aspects of the Protestant faith (what he termed ‘worldly asceticism’) had a direct affinity with the characteristics that went into the making of modern capitalism: namely, self-assurance, self-reliance, and pious industry. But all manner of grand theories were called into play, from the economic and political to the sexual and the psychological. A case in point is the Marxist interpretation, common currency in East Germany less than thirty years ago. According to Marx, the Reformation was the first full bloom of the rise of the middle class against the tyranny of the feudal state. For later East German historians such as Max Steinmetz, this meant it was best understood as the theological expression of the economic and political struggle between the bourgeoisie and the masses of people against the Church of Rome. In this reading of the Reformation, the important figure is not Martin Luther struggling with his conscience in front of the church door. Rather, it is his fellow reformer, and later antagonist, Thomas Müntzer, the preacher of the so-called radical Reformation, who led the peasant armies into battle against the German princes.

This brings us to the modern day, 2017. As might be expected, the quinqucentenary celebrations are the sum of all these parts. The Reformation is still recognised for what it was: a religious movement. REFO500, for instance, a networking project located in the Netherlands, with over 100 partners worldwide, has staged a series of conferences and round-table discussions with a strong focus on the theological aspects of the movement. The emphasis has been placed on ecumenical dialogue, as evidenced by the fact that it is a Reformed (Calvinist) initiative.

At the public level, however, the main trend has been to follow in the footsteps of the twentieth century and squeeze as much historical significance out of the Reformation as the concept will bear. In 2008, for instance, in cooperation with the federal government, the German Evangelical Church launched *Luther 2017: 500 years of the Reformation*. It was based on the notion of a Luther decade, representing the period between his first arrival in Wittenberg in 1508 to the posting of the theses in 1517, and the thinking behind the approach, to paraphrase the words formulated in the *Bundestag*, was to demonstrate the Christian roots, as well as the contribution of faith and the Church, to social responsibility, to the formation of basic rights and the foundations of democracy. In order to bring this idea across, each year of the Luther decade has been devoted to a specific theme – education, freedom, tolerance, and so on – and it has been spread throughout the German lands and beyond. Most waystations in the Luther life-cycle have had an exhibition of some kind. And even the epicentres of the Counter-Reformation, such as Munich and Vienna, have held Reformation exhibitions. Its history is now so firmly bound up with the making of

the modern world that it is easy to forget it was ever confined to so small a space as the dirt streets of Wittenberg. Indeed, a current exhibition in Berlin entitled *The Luther Effect*, described as a ‘global journey through time’, devotes as much space to America, Korea, and Tanzania as it does to northern Europe.

On the whole, as a Reformation scholar, it is hard not to be encouraged by the quincentenary of 2017. There is no doubt that it has raised awareness and sharpened the historical senses. And it has produced scholarship of lasting significance, from new Luther biographies to general studies of the Reformation and ambitious theoretical syntheses. It has also clearly engaged the public imagination and encouraged dialogue. Exhibitions abound, the Reformation has become a lively theme in newspapers, radio, television, and the internet, and Luther has become famous once again, memorialised in everything from Lego figures to malt beer and dress socks.

Nevertheless, and largely for the purposes of provoking this dialogue, I would like to end on a cautious note. Amidst all of the celebration, it has been easy to lose sight of some of the bigger questions. Unlike the other anniversaries of the last few years, the quincentenary has not really tested the basic assumptions of Reformation historiography. Even the elementary issue of inclusion and exclusion remains unresolved: are we celebrating Luther, *his* Reformation, *Reformations* in the plural, or Protestantism – or perhaps Christianity? And indeed should we be celebrating at all? For the free-church communities, the Reformation of Luther and Calvin evokes a period of persecution, forced migration, and marginalisation. Hardly the stuff of

nostalgia. More recently, as the Luther Decade has worked through its roll-call of themes, there has been growing criticism of the tendency to inflate or overstretch the importance of the Reformation. Does it make sense, for instance, to associate Luther's call to conscience with the rise of secularism or religious plurality? Can we really equate this age of orthodoxy with the modern condition?

And on this note, and to end with a cliff-hanger, is it reasonable to associate this call to conscience with the subsequent claims that Protestantism represents 'the right of individuals to interpret the Bible for themselves rather than be forced to submit to "official" interpretations handed down by popes or other centralized religious authorities'?¹¹ Such a claim can only be made by glossing over what Luther and the other reformers actually meant by conscience, side-stepping a century-and-a-half of intolerance and persecution orchestrated by the Reformation's own religious authorities, and assuming that this late-medieval appeal to conscience has passed through the age of Enlightenment, Romanticism, liberalism, and nationalism in its original form unscathed and is still shaping our thoughts today. To do so requires a degree of myth-making not that far removed from Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen's efforts mentioned at the outset. Perhaps we are not so far from Luther the dragon slayer as we like to think.

¹ Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen, 'Beweiß, daß Dr Martin Luther nie existiert hat,' *Allgemeine Deutsche Lehrerzeitung*, 62 (1910), 548-50. Originally published in the *Berliner Conversations-Blatt* 32 (1838).

² Cited in Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the Survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002), 219

³ Johannes Mathesius, *Historien von des Ehrwürdigen in Gott seligen thewren Manns Gottes, Doctoris Martini Luthers, Anfang, Lehr, Leben und Sterben* (Nuremberg, 1567), fols. cxlii^r, cliiii^r; Nikolaus Selnecker, *Historica Oratio vom Leben und Wandel... Martini Lutheri* (Leipzig, 1576), fols. 14^v, 33^r; Valerius Herberger, *Gloria Lutheri et Evangelicorum* (Leipzig, 1608), 31

⁴ Cited in Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, Hero* (Grand Rapids, 1999), 134.

⁵ Conrad Vetter, *Sauber Praesent und Verehrung* (Ingolstadt, 1602), preface, fols. biii^v-biv^r.

⁶ Jacques Benigne Bossuet, *L'Histoire des variations des Églises protestantes* (Paris, 1688), i, fols. aij^r-aij^v.

⁷ Gottlieb Samuel Treuer, *Die politischen Fehler des päbstlichen Hofes welche die Reformation Lutheri sollen befördert haben* (Leipzig, 1718), 19.

⁸ Andreas Riem, 'Wie weit erstreckt sich die Macht der weltlichen Obrigkeit in Religionssachen', *Berlinisches Journal für Aufklärung*, i (1788), 248-9.

⁹ Cited in Thomas Albert Howard, *Remembering the Reformation* (Oxford, 2016), 74.

¹⁰ The episode is discussed in Anne-Kathrin Reulecke, *Täuschend, ähnlich* (Paderborn, 2016), 147-69.

¹¹ Alister McGrath, *Christianity's Dangerous Idea* (London, 2007), 3.